



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/853,296	05/11/2001	Thomas Joseph Prorock	RPS920010017US1	6049

7590 04/08/2004

J. Bruce Schelkopf
IBM Corp., PSG Legal Dept
Dept. 9CCA/Bldg. 002-2
P.O. Box 12195
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER

MCALLISTER, STEVEN B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3627

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/853,296

Applicant(s)

PROROCK ET AL.

Examiner

Steven B. McAllister

Art Unit

3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2,3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. 35 USC 101 requires a claimed invention to be tangible. The claimed software of the claims although "adaptable" for storage on a storage medium, is claimed as stored on any tangible medium, and is therefore intangible.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification does not appear to discuss at all the retrofitting and modification of existing POS terminals with the biometrics devices

Art Unit: 3627

and associated claimed circuitry and software. The specification would not convey to one of ordinary skill in the art that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention at the time of the invention.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification does not appear to discuss at all the retrofitting and modification of existing POS terminals with the biometrics devices and associated claimed circuitry and software. One of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to perform the claimed method without undue experimentation.

It is noted that if it were determined that claim 10 were enabled and sufficiently described in the specification, a restriction would be required between the invention of claim 10 and the invention of claims 1-9 and 11-15.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9 and 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 05-1666066 (066) in view of Walker et al (6,567,787).

066 shows receiving an input; determining and notifying that an override is required; receiving input from a manager; and automatically performing the override procedure for an authorized input. 066 does not show receiving an input from a biometrics device or comparing the input to a list of authorized inputs. Walker et al show receiving a biometric input comprising voice data and comparing the input to a list of authorized inputs (e.g., col. 8, lines 24-35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of 066 by receiving a biometrics input and comparing it with authorized inputs as taught by Walker et al in order to determine an authorization level of the person attempting to perform the override and to determine the user's identity via a characteristic that is inherent to that person.

As to claim 3, 066 in view of Walker et al show all steps except that the override procedure is a series of commands. However, it is notoriously old and well known in the art for an override procedure to comprise a series of commands. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the method of 066 as such in order to deal with more complex override procedures.

Regarding claims 5 and 15, it is noted that only further recitation is to the physical location of an apparatus and that this recitation does not further limit the method or the software. These claims are therefore considered rejected without treatment of the additional recitations. However, in order to speed prosecution they are treated in this action as if they were modifying an apparatus claim.

As to claim 5, 066 in view of Walker et al show all elements of the claim except that an input device is located remotely. However, it is notoriously old and well known in the art to locate an input device remotely. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to do so in order location of such a device in a secure and convenient location.

066 shows an input device for receiving an input; circuitry for determining that an override is required; an output for operator notification, and circuitry for automatically performing the override procedure for an authorized input. 066 does not show a biometrics device; an input output adapter for receiving an input from the biometrics device; or circuitry for comparing the input to a list of authorized users. Walker et al show these elements. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus of 066 by providing the biometrics input device and associated circuitry in order to determine an authorization level of the person attempting to perform an override and to determine the user's identity via a characteristic that is inherent to that person.

As to claim 8, 066 in view of Walker et al show all elements except that the override procedure is a series of software commands. However, it is notoriously old and well known in the art for an override procedure to comprise a series of commands. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the method of 066 as such in order to deal with more complex override procedures.

As to claim 11, it is noted that 066 in view of Walker et al show the software performing all claimed steps.

As to claim 13, 066 in view of Walker et al show all steps except that the override procedure is a series of commands. However, it is notoriously old and well known in the art for an override procedure to comprise a series of commands. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the method of 066 as such in order to deal with more complex override procedures.

As to claim 15, 066 in view of Walker et al show all elements of the claim except that an input device is located remotely. However, it is notoriously old and well known in the art to locate an input device remotely. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to do so in order location of such a device in a secure and convenient location.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven B. McAllister whose telephone number is (703) 308-7052. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 8-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert P. Olszewski can be reached on (703) 308-5183. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Steven B. McAllister